# Sick Woman 1AC

## <Quote>

There has been a slew of writing in recent years about how “female” pain is treated – or rather, not treated as seriously as men’s in emergency rooms and clinics, by doctors, specialists, insurance companies, families, husbands, friends, the culture at large. In a recent article in The Atlantic, called “How Doctors Take Women’s Pain Less Seriously,” a husband writes about the experience of his wife Rachel’s long wait in the ER before receiving the medical attention her condition warranted (which was an ovarian torsion, where an ovarian cyst grows so large it falls, twisting the fallopian tube). “Nationwide, men wait an average of 49 minutes before receiving an analgesic for acute abdominal pain. Women wait an average of 65 minutes for the same thing. Rachel waited somewhere between 90 minutes and two hours,” he writes. At the end of the ordeal, Rachel had waited nearly fifteen hours before going into the surgery she should have received upon arrival. The article concludes with her physical scars [are] healing, but that “she’s still grappling with the psychic toll – what she calls ‘the trauma of not being seen.’” What the article does not mention is race – which leads me to believe that the writer and his wife are white. Whiteness is what allows for such oblivious neutrality: it is the premise of blankness, the presumption of the universal. (Studies have shown that white people will listen to other white people when talking about race, far more openly than they will to a person of color. As someone who is white-passing, let me address white people directly: look at my white face and listen up.) The trauma of not being seen. Again – who is allowed in to the public sphere? Who is allowed to be visible? I don’t mean to diminish Rachel’s horrible experience – I myself once had to wait ten hours in an ER to be diagnosed with a burst ovarian cyst – I only wish to point out the presumptions upon which her horror relies: that our vulnerability should be seen and honored, and that we should all receive care, quickly and in a way that “respects the autonomy of the patient,” as the Four Principles of Biomedical Ethics puts it. Of course, these presumptions are what we all should have. But we must ask the question of who is allowed to have them. In whom does society substantiate such beliefs? And in whom does society enforce the opposite? Compare Rachel’s experience at the hands of the medical establishment with that of Kam Brock’s. In September 2014, Brock, a 32-year-old black woman, born in Jamaica and living in New York City, [she] was driving a BMW when she was pulled over by the police. They accused her of driving under the influence of marijuana, and though her behavior and their search of her car yielded nothing to support this, they nevertheless impounded her car. According to a lawsuit brought against the City of New York and Harlem Hospital by Brock, when Brock appeared the next day to retrieve her car she was arrested by the police for behaving in a way that she calls “emotional,” and involuntarily hospitalized in the Harlem Hospital psych ward. (As someone who has also been involuntarily hospitalized for behaving “too” emotionally, this story feels like a rip of recognition through my brain.) The doctors thought she was “delusional” and suffering from bipolar disorder, because she claimed that Obama followed her on twitter – which was true, but which the medical staff failed to confirm. She was then held for eight days, forcibly injected with sedatives, made to ingest psychiatric medication, attend group therapy, and stripped. The medical records of the hospital – obtained by her lawyers – bear this out: the “master treatment plan” for Brock’s stay reads, “Objective: Patient will verbalize the importance of education for employment and will state that Obama is not following her on Twitter.” It notes her “inability to test reality.” Upon her release, she was given a bill for $13,637.10. The question of why the hospital’s doctors thought Brock “delusional” because of her Obama-follow claim is easily answered: Because, according to this society, a young black woman can’t possibly be that important – and for her to insist that she is must mean she’s “sick.”

#### That was Hedva [[1]](#footnote-1)16.

## Part 1 the Invisible Bodies

#### The resolution asks us to discuss the value of a handgun ban as a political option. But that misses the point, our discourses should not be shaped around the value of varying political actions. Rather it should be questioning the value of the POLITICAL ITSELF. The attempt to discursively engage in issues through public and political action doesn’t work, it fails to recognize bodies that exist as invisible from the public sphere, Hedva [[2]](#footnote-2)2,

In late 2014, I was sick with a chronic condition that, about every 12 to 18 months, gets bad enough to render me, for about five months each time, unable to walk, drive, do my job, sometimes speak or understand language, take a bath without assistance, and leave the bed. This particular flare coincided with the Black Lives Matter protests, which I would have attended unremittingly, had I been able to. I live one block away from MacArthur Park in Los Angeles, a predominantly Latino neighborhood and one colloquially understood to be the place where many immigrants begin their American lives. The park, then, is not surprisingly one of the most active places of protest in the city. I listened to the sounds of the marches as they drifted up to my window. Attached to the bed, I rose up my sick woman fist, in solidarity. I started to think about what modes of protest are afforded to sick people – it seemed to me that many for whom Black Lives Matter is especially in service, might not be able to be present for the marches because they were imprisoned by a job, the threat of being fired from their job if they marched, or literal incarceration, and of course the threat of violence and police brutality – but also because of illness or disability, or because they were caring for someone with an illness or disability. I thought of all the other invisible bodies, with their fists up, tucked away and out of sight. If we take Hannah Arendt’s definition of the political – which is still one of the most dominant in mainstream discourse – as being any action that is performed in public, we must contend with the implications of what that excludes. If being present in public is what is required to be political, then whole swathes [portions] of the population can be deemed a-political – simply because they are not physically able to get their bodies into the street. In my graduate program, Arendt was a kind of god, and so I was trained to think that her definition of the political was radically liberating. Of course, I can see that it was, in its own way, in its time (the late 1950s): in one fell swoop she got rid of the need for infrastructures of law, the democratic process of voting, the reliance on individuals who’ve accumulated the power to affect policy – she got rid of the need for policy at all. All of these had been required for an action to be considered political and visible as such. No, Arendt said, just get your body into the street, and bam: political. There are two failures here, though. The first is her reliance on a “public” – which requires a private, a binary between visible and invisible space. This meant that whatever takes place in private is not political. So, you can beat your wife in private and it doesn’t matter, for instance. You can send private emails containing racial slurs, but since they weren’t “meant for the public,” you are somehow not racist. Arendt was worried that if everything can be considered political, then nothing will be, which is why she divided the space into one that is political and one that is not. But for the sake of this anxiety, she chose to sacrifice whole groups of people, to continue to banish them to invisibility and political irrelevance. She chose to keep them out of the public sphere. I’m not the first to take Arendt to task for this. The failure of Arendt’s political was immediately exposed in the civil rights activism and feminism of the 1960s and 70s. “The personal is political” can also be read as saying “the private is political.” Because of course, everything you do in private is political: who you have sex with, how long your showers are, if you have access to clean water for a shower at all, and so on. There is another problem too. As Judith Butler put it in her 2015 lecture, “Vulnerability and Resistance,” Arendt failed to account for who is allowed in to the public space, of who’s in charge of the public. Or, more specifically, who’s in charge of who gets in. Butler says that there is always one thing true about a public demonstration: the police are already there, or they are coming. This resonates with frightening force when considering the context of Black Lives Matter. The inevitability of violence at a demonstration – especially a demonstration that emerged to insist upon the importance of bodies who’ve been violently un-cared for – ensures that a certain amount of people won’t, because they can’t, show up. Couple this with physical and mental illnesses and disabilities that keep people in bed and at home, and we must contend with the fact that many whom these protests are for, are not able to participate in them – which means they are not able to be visible as political activists.

#### And put away your generic state good turns, they don’t apply. My criticism is not of the existence of the state but rather it is a criticism of the concept of the Public Sphere as being one in which we solve. Also functions as terminal defense to any 1NC alternative utilizing a political methodology, they only produce more violence.

#### We construct “health” as a method of excluding bodies that deviate from this norm. This form of forgetting allows systemic exclusion to go unnoticed. We group the invisible as deviant and unworthy for engagement, this process disables all who deviate from the pre-conceived “normal”, Hedva [[3]](#footnote-3)3,

Ann Cvetkovich writes: “What if depression, in the Americas, at least, could be traced to histories of colonialism, genocide, slavery, legal exclusion, and everyday segregation and isolation that haunt all of our lives, rather than to be biochemical imbalances?” I’d like to change the word “depression” here to be all mental illnesses. Cvetkovich continues: “Most medical literature tends to presume a white and middle-class subject for whom feeling bad is frequently a mystery because it doesn’t fit a life in which privilege and comfort make things seem fine on the surface.” In other words, wellness as it is talked about in America today, is a white and wealthy idea. Let me quote Starhawk, in the preface to the new edition of her 1982 book Dreaming the Dark: “Psychologists have constructed a myth – that somewhere there exists some state of health which is the norm, meaning that most people presumably are in that state, and those who are anxious, depressed, neurotic, distressed, or generally unhappy are deviant.” I’d here supplant the word “psychologists” with “white supremacy,” “doctors,” “your boss,” “neoliberalism,” “heteronormativity,” and “America.”

#### This also means the 1AC functions as a starting point discussion for other modes of understanding power relations, since all other literature assumes a non-disability starting point.

## Part 2 the Vulnerable Bodies

#### Sick Woman Theory is a call for recognition. A call for vulnerability. It is a rallying cry for the invisible and a method of engagement for the visible, it is an all-encompassing method of relational understandings between agents, it is a resistance against the very world that makes us sick, Hedva [[4]](#footnote-4)4,

Sick Woman Theory is for those who are faced with their vulnerability and unbearable fragility, every day, and so have to fight for their experience to be not only honored, but first made visible. For those who, in Audre Lorde’s words, were never meant to survive: because this world was built against their survival. It’s for my fellow spoonies. You know who you are, even if you’ve not been attached to a diagnosis: one of the aims of Sick Woman Theory is to resist the notion that one needs to be legitimated by an institution, so that they can try to fix you. You don’t need to be fixed, my queens – it’s the world that needs the fixing. I offer this as a call to arms and a testimony of recognition. I hope that my thoughts can provide articulation and resonance, as well as tools of survival and resilience. And for those of you who are not chronically ill or disabled, Sick Woman Theory asks you to stretch your empathy this way. To face us, to listen, to see. Sick Woman Theory is an insistence that most modes of political protest are internalized, lived, embodied, suffering, and no doubt invisible. Sick Woman Theory redefines existence in a body as something that is primarily and always vulnerable, following from Judith Butler’s work on precarity and resistance. Because the premise insists that a body is defined by its vulnerability, not temporarily affected by it, the implication is that it is continuously reliant on infrastructures of support in order to endure, and so we need to re-shape the world around this fact. Sick Woman Theory maintains that the body and mind are sensitive and reactive to regimes of oppression – particularly our current regime of neoliberal, white-supremacist, imperial-capitalist, cis-hetero-patriarchy. It is that all of our bodies and minds carry the historical trauma of this, that it is the world itself that is making and keeping us sick.

#### And put away your intersectionality critique, yes the 1AC is a focus on disability but the Sick Woman applies to any body excluded from the social realm. It’s an analysis of the disabling effects of invisibility.

#### The Sick Woman is a method of empowerment, a method of engaging particularities of experiences while still providing a rallying cry to the un-cared for, Hedva [[5]](#footnote-5)5,

To take the term “woman” as the subject-position of this work is a[n] strategic, all-encompassing embrace and dedication to the particular, rather than the universal. Though the identity of “woman” has erased and excluded many (especially women of color and trans and genderfluid people), I choose to use it because it still represents the un-cared for, the secondary, the oppressed, the non-, the un-, the less-than. The problematics of this term will always require critique, and I hope that Sick Woman Theory can help undo those in its own way. But more than anything, I’m inspired to use the word “woman” because I saw this year how it can still be radical to be a woman in the 21st century. I use it to honor a dear friend of mine who came out as genderfluid last year. For her, what mattered the most was to be able to call herself a “woman,” to use the pronouns “she/her.” She didn’t want surgery or hormones; she loved her body and her big dick and didn’t want to change it – she only wanted the word. That the word itself can be an empowerment is the spirit in which Sick Woman Theory is named. The Sick Woman is an identity and body that can belong to anyone denied the privileged existence – or the cruelly optimistic promise of such an existence – of the white, straight, healthy, neurotypical, upper and middle-class, cis- and able-bodied man who makes his home in a wealthy country, has never not had health insurance, and whose importance to society is everywhere recognized and made explicit by that society; whose importance and care dominates that society, at the expense of everyone else. The Sick Woman is anyone who does not have this guarantee of care.

#### A focus on particularity is key, abstractions make solvency impossible because they ignore key features of existence necessary for understanding the perspective of the un-cared for, Mills[[6]](#footnote-6),

But though **particularism (in this group-based form) responds to a real problem**, its solution arguably results from a faulty diagnosis. **Dominant abstractions may indeed be remote,** dominant principles may indeed be unhelpful, dominant categories may indeed be alienating; **but this lack of ﬁt between generality and one’s experience** (the maleness and whiteness of the supposedly general, genderless, and colorless view from nowhere)arguably **arises not from abstraction and generality** per se**, but an abstraction and generality that abstract[s] away from gender and race. The problem is that they are deﬁcient abstractions of the ideal-as-idealized-model kind**, not that they are abstractions tout court**. What one wants are abstractions of the ideal-as-descriptive-model kind that capture the essentials of the situation of [the oppressed] women and nonwhites**, not abstract away from them. Global **concepts like patriarchy and white supremacy** arguably **fulﬁll this role**, as Marxism’s class society/capitalism did (however inadequately for non-class oppressions) for earlier generations**. These terms are abstractions that do reﬂect the speciﬁcities of group experience,** thereby potentially generating categories and principles that **illuminate** rather than obfuscate **the reality of different kinds of subordination.**

#### This also takes out your blanket modes of solvency, an understanding of particularities is key. Specifically, the affirmation of existence through vulnerability produced by the 1AC is uniquely key, it challenges dominant modes of knowledge production and allows an esteeming of all bodies and their inherent vulnerability, Campbell in 03[[7]](#footnote-7),

**Our discussion engages the imagination by playing** dangerously(yet cautiously) **with maters of ‘disability ‘**desire’, ‘pride’, ‘culture’ and a transgressive aesthetic. It is a vulnerable conversation, a speaking otherwise about ‘disability’. **By adopting the ‘thought of the outside’ (**as expressed by Foucault, 1988, Orig 1966) **and repositioning our gaze it maybe possible to open up ‘spaces’ for** oppositional technologies **of self that posit ‘disability’ as a positive erotic, grounds for subjugated celebratory experiences of ‘disability’.** As Cheryl Wade puts **“what is missing [is].. a true esteeming of the** Cripple **[disabled] body”** (1994: 35). In this sense, Chapter Seven turns a corner in the dissertation by marking out sites of resistance to technologies of ableism.

## Part 3 the Call for Recognition

#### Our advocacy is that the judge should endorses the 1AC’s performance of Sick Woman Theory as a method of recognizing and giving voice to the social invisible.

#### The role of the judge should be an educator whose job is to challenge dominant ableist mindsets that construct and exclude bodies as invisible, Beckett in 2013[[8]](#footnote-8),

#### Serious and systemic disability discrimination provides powerful justification for¶ disability-focused anti-oppressive pedagogy (Beckett 2009), but such pedagogy is also¶ critical to the development of a more ‘innovative and aggressive conception of¶ inclusive education’ (Slee 2011, i). If inclusive education is to help build an inclusive¶ society (Armstrong and Barton 2008), then in addition to meaningful inclusion of¶ disabled students within mainstream settings (itself, likely to do much to challenge¶ disability), schools’ teaching and learning strategies must challenge disability as a¶ form of oppression.¶ Proposed here is a form of ‘inclusive pedagogy’, but not as currently understood.¶ Inclusive pedagogy is usually defined in terms of rethinking curricula and teaching¶ practices to include everyone (Florian and Black-Hawkins 2011). This is vital and a¶ prerequisite for the anti-oppressive pedagogy proposed herein: inclusion, in all¶ regards, being ‘a prerequisite of a democratic education’ (Slee 2011, i).¶ The connection between ‘inclusive’ and ‘democratic’ education, although well¶ established, has been reworked by authors in ‘Disability Studies in Education’¶ (Danforth and Gabel 2006). For example, Goodley (2011) calls for dialogue between¶ critical pedagogy and disability politics. To this end, Baglieri and Shapiro (2012),¶ Gabel and Connors (2009) and Ware (2002) suggest incorporating Disability Studies¶ into the curriculum within US schools. Overall, this work implies that strategies¶ encouraging/supporting students to challenge disability as one form of oppression¶ ought to be part of education for all.¶ If non-disabled students are not encouraged to recognize and challenge disability¶ oppression, then as adults they may **reinforce** and legitimize **disabling ideas and practices** (Rieser and Mason 1990). Disabled students need to be supported to¶ recognize and understand the nature of their oppression and acquire skills to resist¶ this (Mason 1990). Arguably, they also need to be included in such initiatives because¶ relationships between disabled people can be marked by oppression (Wendell 1996).¶ We need to view all students as potentially having a ‘foot in both camps’ i.e.¶ ‘oppressed’ and ‘privileged’.

#### This is the only alternative. Any other method only delays relevant discourse and denies the possibility of solving, recognition of the 1ACs discourse of giving visibility to those rendered invisible is key, Evans et al in 12,[[9]](#footnote-9)

Lack of community discussion is neither random nor power-neutral. We have tried to have discussions. These discussions have been regularly derailed—in “wrong forum” arguments, in the demand for “evidence,” in the unfair burdens placed on the aggrieved as a pre-requisite for engagement. Read the last ten years of these discussions on edebate archives: Ede Warner on edebate and move forward to Rashad Evans diversity discussion from 2010 to Deven Cooper to Amber Kelsie’s discussion on CEDA Forums and the NDT CEDA Traditions page. We have been talking for over a decade, we have been reaching out for years, we have been listening to the liberal, moderate refrain of “we agree with your goals but not with your method.” We will no longer wait for the community to respond, to relinquish privilege, to engage in authentic discussion, since largely the community seems incapable of producing a consensus for responding to what “we all agree” is blatant structural inequity. It seems that meta-debates/discussions about debate are generally met with denial, hostility and—more often—silence. This silence is in fact a focused silence**.** It is not people in the Resistance Facebook group that comprise these silent figures—it is (as has been described) “the old boys club.” We have been quite vocal—and we believe that it is this very vocalness (and the development of a diversity of tactics in response to status quo stalling tactics) that has provoked response when response was given. Sarah Spring’s cedadebate post is a case in point. The decision to change our speaker point scale is not in order to produce a “judging doomsday apparatus” (this kind of apocalyptic rhetoric might more aptly be applied to the current racist/sexist/classist state of affairs in this community), though we must admit that we are flattered that our efforts have affected the community enough to result in such a hyberbolic labeling. **It** indicates that civil disobedience is still an effective tactic; the debate community should take it as an indication that our calls for change are serious. We will continue to innovate and collaborate on tactics of resistance. This “crisis” in debate has no end in sight. The rationale for changing the point scale was not simply to “reward” people for preferring the unpreferred critic. We recognize that MPJ produces effects, and we hoped that changing our point scale was a small but significant tactic that was available to the disenfranchised in this community. MPJ:

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who has the best methodology to exposing, understanding, and solving ableist mindsets.

#### The classroom is key- it is a starting point for embodied knowledges which skew our epistemic lenses making challenging ableist mindsets necessary to evaluate any other layer of the flow, Ervelles [[10]](#footnote-10)2K,

For example, critical theorists of education have begun to describehow **bodies are inscribed by** the **dominant cultural practices** of schools **through** a process that Peter McLaren has called **“**enfleshment**.” To be “**enfleshed**,”** McLaren explains**, is to be marked by discourses that** not only sit on the surface of the fleshbut **are,** on the other hand, **embedded in the flesh such that we learn “a way of being in our bodies**…that is we are taught to think about our bodies and how to experience our bodies.” **One context where students learn to experience their bodies is education,** where students learn the importance of disciplining their bodies so as not to distract from the “mental efforts” of the mind**. In an attempt to control these “**disruptive excesses**” of unruly bodies, schools have** elaborate **practices that support the rigid organization of classroom space** and time, the overriding emphasis on discipline, and the careful monitoring of the curriculum. **So entrenched are these practices that** Ursula Kelly has argued that **“education is the body and education territorializes the body” since “the notion of *mind/ing bodies* bespeaks** most accurately and succinctly **about how the intersection of** knowledge**, power**, anddesire **craft[s] [subjectivity] as the cultural project of schools.”**

#### And an analysis of invisibility is a prior question to any other form of discourse, understanding why bodies are excluded from discursive spaces is necessary to have meaningful dialogue to begin with, Boys in 08[[11]](#footnote-11),

This shifts the inquiry from representations (on the body, in the space) to relationships, processes and contexts. Any encounter is **necessarily** mediated by who is there, who is not, why they are there **(or why not), what they bring to the situation and what they take away.** Such events involve meanings-in-the-making through a process in space and over time. **Importantly** encounters are not just a space of sharing and recognition but also of conflict, differentiation and negotiation. They involve interpretations, talk, gestures, bodily relationships, and actions. **So how do encounters** work? **In each case we now have two questions which allow the exploration of disability beyond being a stereotypical marker of identity or difference. What embodied knowledge and experience do we the participants bring to the encounter? What are the routine social and spatial practices which frame the encounter?** Here, disabled and ‘non-disabled’ participants are not separated out; all have parity in the space of the encounter itself. But the impact of framing disabled people in ways not of their making remains central to the investigation. **As Davis write**s**:** Disability is not so much the lack of a sense or the presence of a physical or mental impairment as it is the reception and construction of that difference.

#### As a judge, you are an educator and have an obligation to protect students and make rounds inclusive – this is primarily a question of in round practices, Smith [[12]](#footnote-12)’13,

**“**It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of **social control**, the reality ofracism **in debate is constituted by** the singular **choices that** institutions, **coaches**, and students **make** on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to **abstractions** to **distance the conversation from the** material **reality** that black **debaters** are forced to **deal with every day.** One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms** would **have competitors** do intellectual gymnastics or **make up rules to accuse** black **debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations** but as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed**, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, **and** then find strategies to **deal with the issues at hand.** It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. **A student should not**, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, **have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential.** Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape. Current **coaches** and competitors alike **dismiss concerns of** racism and **exclusion, won’t teach other students anything** about identity in debate **other than** how **to shut down** competitors who engage in **alternative** styles and **discourses**, and refuse to engage in those discussions even outside of a tournament setting. A conversation on privilege and identity was held at a debate institute I worked at this summer and just as any theorist of privilege would predict it was the heterosexual, white, male staff members that either failed to make an appearance or stay for the entire discussion. No matter how talented they are, we have to remember that the students we work with are still just high school aged children. **If those who are responsible for participants and** the creation of accessible **norms won't risk a better future** for our community, **it becomes harder to explain to students who look up to them why risking such an endeavor is necessary.”**

#### What we say here matters because debate has transformative potential and real world implications in several facets of life. If we allow these types of arguments and discourse allows debaters to go into the real world and engage in actual practices, Vincent [[13]](#footnote-13)13,

Until we re-conceptualize the speech and the speech act, and until judges are comfortable enough to vote down debaters for a performance that perpetuates violence in the debate space, **debaters and coaches** alike will **remain complacent in their privilege**. As educators we must begin to shift the paradigm and be comfortable doing this. As a community **we should stop looking at ourselves as isolated in a vacuum and recognize that the discourse and knowledge we produce in debate has real implications for how we think when we leave this space**. Our performances must be viewed as of the body instead of just by it. As long **as we continue to operate in a world where our performances are merely by bodies, we will continue to foster a climate of hostility and violence towards [minority] students of color, and** in turn destroy **the transformative potential this community could have.**

#### Debaters must be held accountable for the discourse they produce in round. Judge need to be active allies and engage in a process of disrupting the flow in light of a teachable moment, Vincent [[14]](#footnote-14)13,

**Debaters must be held accountable for the words they say in the round.** We should no longer evaluate the speech. Instead we must begin to evaluate the speech act itself. Debaters must be held accountable **for more than winning the debate. They must be held accountable for the implications of that speech.** **As educators and adjudicators in the debate space we** also **have an ethical obligation to foster an atmosphere of education. It is not enough for judges to offer predispositions suggesting that they do not endorse [oppressive] racist, sexist, homophobic discourse, or justify why they do not hold that belief, and still offer a rational reason why they voted for it. Judges have become complacent** in voting on the discourse, **if the other debater does not provide a clear enough role of the ballot framing, or does not articulate well enough why the racist discourse should be rejected.** Judges must be willing to foster a learning atmosphere by holding debaters accountable for what they say in the round. **They must be willing to vote against a debater if they endorse [oppressive] racist discourse. They must be willing to disrupt the process of the flow for the purpose of embracing that teachable moment. The speech must be connected to the speech act.** We must view the entire debate as a performance of the body, instead of the argument solely on the flow.

# Frontlines (shorten them)

# 1AR Framing Modules

## ROB/ROJ Framing

#### Our role of the judge is to be an educator who challenges dominant ableist mindsets and our role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who has the best methodology to exposing, understanding, and solving ableist mindsets. Our method and framing doesn’t care solely about the consequences that our speech acts will have in a post fiat world or even after the round rather we care about the process we engage in as debaters in the space. Our Vincent evidence says that the judge needs to endorse performativity in debate and become active allies in our movements, and our Beckett evidence says the mentalities we adopt in round are transportable, meaning it’s not just about who’s winning the flow it’s about what those arguments on the flow mean in the grand scheme of things. This is not to say consequences don’t matter rather a consequence focus is bad, we need to look at the round holistically and embrace every speech as a potential for teachable moments. Our methodology is one of recognition, in which the classroom becomes a safe space for those deemed socially invisible to interact and engage. Our Hedva evidence says embracing Sick Woman theory as a methodology for engagement means acknowledging all bodies are inherently vulnerable, and that understanding and solving oppression in the empirical world does not come from coalitional movements rather from interpersonal recognition, our solvency comes from lived experiences and their recognition which ruptures dominant ableist mindsets that control our knowledge production, that’s Campbell. And our Ervelles evidence says that the classroom space is uniquely key since it is the starting point of embodied knowledges, which also functions as a takeout to our framing mechanisms that have a non-classroom focus since the classroom space always skews our epistemic lenses.

## Fairness Framing

#### The 1NC misses the point entirely, they conceded our role of the ballot and judge which functions as a framing mechanism for every other argument in the round. Your fairness impacts always come second because they rely on a pre-fixed notion of what debate is, i.e. in soccer it’s “fair” to kick the ball but in basketball it’s “fair” to dribble it. Our Beckett evidence says the debate round’s primary function is to be a source of liberation for the disabled body, and our Vincent and Smith evidence says it’s the judges role to be an active ally in that movement. This means “fairness” in context of debate is reducing and resisting ableist mindsets. This also means they can’t leverage their engagement args or fairness first args because they A) assume we’re saying fairness bad when instead we are just redefining what fairness is and B) assume fairness is some external impact when in reality it only makes sense contextualized by our role of the ballot and judge.

## AT Policy Making Framing

#### Their policy focus misses the point, our framework is to evaluate the process of debate and the role of the judge is to be an educator and to act as an active ally in our movements. The role of your ballot is to endorse the best methodology for exposing, understanding, and solving ableist mindsets. However, the policymaking focus of the 1NC ignores what is important, a policy focus restricts our discourse to be purely on consequences but our argument is not just about the consequences of our method but also the performance we utilize. Our Vincent evidence says that debate is a holistic and judges and debaters need to embrace performativity in the round and not just evaluate arguments in a technical manner, rather evaluate arguments in terms of what they justify. The 1NC makes solvency impossible because the focus on the political is always a focus on the public. This always necessarily excludes bodies who exist as socially invisible from engaging within the movements which is antithetical to their purpose, that’s Hedva 16.

# AT T/Theory

## T Specific Disad

#### The idea that we must be topical is the very mentality we critique. Your argument is that rigid and strict definition of the space should exist to filter the modes of discourse we can engage in but our argument is that your very mentality always necessarily excludes disabled perspectives. Our Ervelles evidence says that disabled bodies are always separated out as deviant and your drop the debater arguments are equivalent to “send the disabled kids to special-ed we don’t want to deal with you anymore”. Your arguments also assume some benefit to engaging in topical discourse, i.e. it results in transportable skills. But our Hedva evidence says discussion of this topic is always a bad thing because a politics focused discourse always results in methods that perpetuate social invisibility. Takes out your education claims because our argument is that being non-topical is a good thing because the topic by nature is oppressive. And don’t let them extend their fairness claims as disads the education of our position obviously determines the value of having a fair method of engagement is. For example if the resolution was “resolved slavery was good” it’s obviously more predictable and fair under their interpretation to defend slavery being good but that defense is obviously a bad thing.

## Engagement Disad

#### Theory/T is a refusal to engage with the 1AC, you should recognize this as a teachable moment and vote affirmative to disrupt the flow and disrupt the exclusionary methods of the 1NC, McElwain 14[[15]](#footnote-15),

When coaches and educators dismiss literature from other parts of the library for referencing “obscurantist” philosophy, they do a disservice to their students. What does seem to be true to me is that running theory against such criticism can only result in intervention. It’s simple—reading theory is such a tremendous refusal to engage with the substance of the kritik that either the judge is similarly unwilling to engage and will reject the kritik on face or the judge looks to the substance of the kritik and acknowledges that running theory merely feeds the link. I’ve heard many attempts to justify why certain hypothetical pre-fiat arguments would justify running theory, and it’s easy to agree with many of them, but I have never seen such an argument in a real debate round. I have never heard a debater say that they should win for saying racism is bad or that I should drop their opponent because they are male. The actual pre-fiat arguments I hear students make are sophisticated and rely on literature that has great depth and demands engagement and not dismissal. Although an entire other article would have to be written about substantive ways to engage with arguments about race or gender, it goes without saying that the first step is to accept that your opponent is saying something, rather than rejecting their arguments out of hand. Don’t assume what your opponent does is “pre-fiat”, “performance”, or “resistance”, listen, and let them tell you what they are doing. Even if you want to talk about moral philosophy, you should have the conviction to defend the value of philosophical education rather than relying on what amounts to a procedural argument to get out of explicitly defending your values. It should go without saying, but if a model of debate cannot even justify its own educational value, why should it ever win a round?

## AT Topical Version of the Aff

#### <Politics Specific>: Just because you say the term ableism in your attempts to create a topical version of the aff doesn’t mean your version of the aff can garner the same form of solvency our aff does. Our Hedva 16 evidence says political methods always exclude the socially invisible meaning there is no possible topical version of the 1AC because in attempting to be topical we eliminate the ability to solve the impacts outlined in the aff.

#### <General>: The topical version of the 1AC functions as a filter for narratives, you may claim topicality is the floor not the ceiling but in defining a starting point for discussion you are attempting to reframe the disabled narrative in a manner that is more “pleasing” to listen to. Our Hedva and Campbell evidence says that narratives are self-defined and cannot be totalized lest the cease to be narratives. Your role as a judge is to create a safe space for discussion which necessarily requires you to accept the narratives we present regardless of the format. Our Vincent evidence also says you must be active allies and embrace teachable moments, the 1NC attempt to confine my narrative is an instance of a teachable so you must now disrupt the flow and vote affirmative as a form of affirmation of your role. Our Evans evidence also says that delay tactics such as topicality are uniquely bad for the movement because it guarantees our narratives will never be heard. There will always be a more topical version of the aff and the existence of binary T interps guarantees I always violate something, as such you shouldn’t base your evaluation based on small technical arguments and instead take a step back and look at the big picture. If the 1AC discourse is a good thing, which all of our solvency and framing evidence says it is, you should endorse it fully.

### AT Fairness Args

1. Cross apply the Boys argument here it does some very good framing, the relevant question is not “what you do to skew discourse” it’s “who has access to that discourse to begin with”. The disabled body is always excluded from discursive spaces meaning A) your impact is non-unique and definitely outweighed on magnitude B) endorsing the 1AC is a necessary condition to understand what fairness even is.
2. Cross apply Ervelles here, rigid structuring of the educational space is the root of ableist mentalities and will always exclude those who are considered “deviant”. The 1NC is literally attempting to create a more “perfect” form of my performance and control my narrative, saying since I deviate from their norm I shouldn’t be allowed in the space. Independent reason to drop them if we win our framing.
3. Our arguments always outweigh in terms of solvency, what does voting for their theory shell really do? It definitely doesn’t stop me from reading my performance, and it definitely is not setting a norm for debate. But when you vote aff there is an actual impact. Cross apply Beckett, rejecting ableist mindsets in education is key lest we perpetuate them out of round.
4. Beckett reframes what the judges obligation actually is, sure fairness is important but it’s always a secondary concern to resisting and challenging ableist mindsets.

### AT People will quit (Spyce and lyle)

1. The biggest empirical claim without an empirical warrant in debate. This card is about policy in 2007 and is an analytic arg in card form. It wasn’t true even for policy, but definitely isn’t true now tournament attendance is at an all-time high for all tournaments, e.g. this tournament.
2. Turn: more novices are discouraged from competing due to theory than anything else – use your own experience as a coach and you know that’s true. It’s far more exclusive and ignores the entirety of the case you labored over.

## AT T Tricks

### AT You can evaluate unfair rounds

1. Just because someone could not answer an argument doesn’t mean it isn’t true. There are still warrants, and even if you could have answered them there’s no guarantee they’re wrong. If I was structurally precluded from reading answers to “2+2,” you still know that’s true because it logically cannot not be true by definition. This is premised on an absurd theory of truth where we only know something as true with argument, obviously false
2. If unfair rounds are irresolvable then no round is resolvable because things like coach ability to allocate prep, money to go to tournaments and camp, and etc, so then there are skews that you don’t know who debated better in any round but you have to resolve rounds, so you should assume this is false. This fairness precludes arg doesn’t abide by the fake difference between in and out of round unfairness.

### AT Constitutive features of games

1. Lay judges prove that the only thing that makes you a judge that you couldn’t be is that you’re here and getting paid/fulfilling an obligation. Those other things don’t apply in other cases. Constitutive features are non-unique.
2. Begs the question of what features define the game – my role of the ballot specifies unique features of the game, like its educational features, and the context of the judge, that you are obliged to enforce.
3. Games rule enforcement varies – if you violate the letter of some karaoke rule, the real duty of the adjudicator is to let you get away with to achieve the GOAL of the game, which is to make it fun for everyone. Debate is one of those games since there are no explicit rules but speech times. The goal that must be enforced is my arguments in the role of the ballot.
4. Even if debate is constituted as a game, it is not all that debate is – it is also constituted by being a speech where students exchange voices and learn about things. Those are more important because they are more unique features of debate; lots of things are games.
5. Context is important for games – for example the game of improv wouldn’t make sense without an audience. The context for debate is a judge-enforced education space as anything we say about real world things wouldn’t make sense without it. You can’t get other constitutive features of debate without this, so this controls the internal link to their warrants.

### AT Jurisdiction is an independent voting issue

1. Begs the question of fairness – the ballot doesn’t say you have to vote for the topic, literally no warrant at all. The only possible warrant for why is fairness, which is answered above. Its not constitutive, that’s just obfuscating.
2. If this is true, it means you can’t vote on theory since it’s something external to the truth or falsity of the res. Instead, you have to vote for the person with the most offense in the direction of the topic, that’s me.
3. Turn: if my Role of the Ballot arguments are true, you don’t have a jurisdiction to vote on arguments external to it, including theory. Prefer it to this jurisdiction arg since it’s about your constitutive role.

### AT Resolvability is an independent voter

1. No it’s not – K rounds are resolvable since you’ve resolved them before. The voter part is an empirical claim about you being able to resolve rounds. You can, so no impact, those rounds had winners and I’m winning.
2. Begs the question of what is irresolvable – under my interp of burdens the debate is resolvable, the stuff they say is irresolvable doesn’t matter to your decision.
3. My stuff proves those sorts of evaluations cannot objectively occur or don’t achieve their impacts, which turns their impacts.

### AT Fairness turns engagement (Galloway or analytic)

1. Even if it links to my role of the ballot, not by much, and my stuff outweighs. Your interp prevents more important and voluminous discussion.
2. No reason your discussion is key to my role of the ballot. I don’t think discussion is inherently good. Also even if discussion is good, and I did good enough for the both of us.
3. No proof you would have engaged. And, no proof you’d have engaged the right parts. If I didn’t do this you probably would have run T on something else, empirically confirmed with you specifically, so engagement is non-unique.

# AT Disads

## AT Real World Solvency Disad

#### Their arguments miss the point of the 1AC. Our argument isn’t that the 1AC as a speech act will somehow magically solve ableism entirely in the real world, rather our argument is about the process of debating methods. Our Beckett evidence says that we need to care about understanding and combatting ableism in the SPACE ITSELF because mentalities we adopt here are transported out of round. Winning our 1AC is not contingent on winning some external impact rather it’s contingent on our performance within the round and our method being a good thing because it will go on to effect the way we act out of round.

### AT No Real Solvency

#### We don’t care if movements in the real world are effected by my discussion the only thing our performance cares about as per our Beckett evidence is the effect it has on (however many people are in the room).

## AT Cooption Disad

#### On their cooption arguments:

#### Your argument is that the state will coopt any method we engage in but our argument is that the discourse produced by the 1AC denies the conditions necessary for cooption to occur. Our Hedva evidence says that once we recognize vulnerability this round will become a miniature safe space of resistance that cannot be coopted because there is no power the (whatever they say will coopt our movement) can hold.

#### All your evidence says political movements get coopted by power structures fine we’ll concede that our argument isn’t political it’s individualistic. The 1AC is a focus on interpersonal recognition not coalition, meaning cooption can never occur because there is no way for the (insert power structure name here) to coopt our voices and our narratives.

#### Even if cooption is possible signing the ballot aff in recognition of disabled narratives ruptures the power structure’s ability to utilize and marginalize our voices. Our Campbell evidence says disabled narratives rupture hegemonic epistemic lenses meaning cooption is impossible.

#### At the worst cooption is inevitable in which case it’s just try or die for the 1AC because our arguments and our narratives at least have the potential to reshape the way the hegemonic power structure frames and evaluates disability through the use of disruptive narrative intervention, that’s Campbell.

## AT Weighing Modes of Oppression

#### There is a huge difference between saying X outweighs Y and saying analyzing X is necessary to understand Y. Our argument is not saying disability is most important it’s saying that in order to resolve the impacts the 1NC outlines you must first understand the 1AC. It’s not a question of impact framing it’s a question of sequencing, and we don’t claim the judge should vote for the most important form of oppression rather they are just endorsing productive modes of solvency. Understanding embodiment and embodied knowledges function as necessary conditions for solving other modes of oppression, meaning our discourse is a prior evaluative question, Ervelles[[16]](#footnote-16),

Just as the day presses on impervious to its unpredictability, the field of disability studies also presses on buoyed by a similar capriciousness. It would appear that my own location as alternately "outsider within" (Hill-Collins, 1998) and/or just "outsider" is made possible by the very nature of disability studies. According to Hill-Collins (1998), **"outsider-within" describes "the location of people who no longer belong to any one group"** (5), **as well as the "social locations** or border spaces **occupied by groups of unequal power"** (5). **This** nomadic **existence at the borders produces a tentative non-authoritarian knowledge that is** simultaneously **marginal and perceptive, "embrac[ing] multiplicity yet remain[ing] cognizant of power"** (8). I argue that **similar ambiguities frame the field of disability studies providing** several **manifestos for life at the borderlands. These** manifestos **are replete** not with directives but **with the most radical re-imagining of possibilities. They thrive on the unthinkable of ableist discourses. They** produce few answers but rather **embrace the infuriating practice of constantly troubling the questions. They make even the radical seem** quite **conservative. Take any radical theory—**radical humanism, marxism, post structuralism, critical race theory, feminist theory, queer theory, etc**. Place a disruptive disability studies in its midst. Tentatively pose questions. Trouble their assumptions undergirding their** alternative/radical **conceptions of the normal.** What is autonomy? **When** exactly **is life not worth living? Why does rationality have to be the sole determinant of our humanity?** How do we define limit? **Listen carefully to their answers.**

## AT Narrative Endorsements

#### Our argument is not that the judge endorses our narrative our argument is that the judge endorses the best methodology to allow narratives to be heard. Our Hedva evidence says Sick Woman theory is the best methodology for allowing narratives to be heard in the classroom space because it recognizes all agent’s inherent vulnerabilities. Your disad would only apply if we gave the judge the power to validate our narrative but our argument is that our narratives are always valid but the judge’s orientation toward our narrative is what is relevant.

## AT Weighing Experiences

#### Our position is not a question of weighing experiences as “my oppression is worse than your oppression” rather it’s a question of methodologies. Our argument is that the process of debate is one in which students can engage in liberatory discussions, that’s Smith. Our Vincent evidence says that the judge should be an active ally and endorse METHODS not validate experience, meaning we can still weigh solvency without questioning the legitimacy of each other’s personal experiences.

# AT Other Ks

## AT Cap

#### 1AC is key to resisting cap, it encourages a recognition of the inherent vulnerability and dependence of all bodies, key to breaking down power structures, Heldva [[17]](#footnote-17)16,

I used to think that the most anti-capitalist gestures left had to do with love, particularly love poetry: to write a love poem and give it to the one you desired, seemed to me a radical resistance. But now I see I was wrong. The most anti-capitalist protest is to care for another and to care for yourself. To take on the historically feminized and therefore invisible practice of nursing, nurturing, caring. To take seriously each other’s vulnerability and fragility and precarity, and to support it, honor it, empower it. To protect each other, to enact and practice community. A radical kinship, an interdependent sociality, a politics of care. Because, once we are all ill and confined to the bed, sharing our stories of therapies and comforts, forming support groups, bearing witness to each other’s tales of trauma, prioritizing the care and love of our sick, pained, expensive, sensitive, fantastic bodies, and there is no one left to go to work, perhaps then, finally, capitalism will screech to its much-needed, long-overdue, and motherfucking glorious halt.

## AT Gatekeeper K

#### Your argument is that we give positions of privilege the ability to validate our movement but our argument is not about validation it’s about recognition. Our narrative is never more or less legitimate based on the ballot the ballot is a symbolic act of acceptance that allows the space to be one of inclusion, that’s Evans. Also our Hedva evidence is great on this issue, your argument assumes a position of privilege for the judge but Sick Woman theory recognizes the vulnerability of everyone and creates a safe space for the excluded and a method of engagement for the privileged meaning the disad no longer applies to the 1AC.

# AT Specific School Prep-Outs

## AT Ghill K

### AT Ferri May

#### Your tag is the opposite impact of what your card says, your card says feminist appropriations of disability are done in ways that are not intersectional, obviously that is not the aff approach. Also this is just a link of omission, obviously the strength given that is very marginal.

### AT Garland Thompson

#### Doesn’t apply the 1AC doesn’t utilize a monster metaphor, the Sick Woman is a universal term of unity for bodies rendered socially invisible.

### AT Hughes

#### No link I don’t universalize disability. There is no reason the aff is a Universalist ontology of disability. It exposes particularities of oppression through the Sick Woman. We are a very particular performance.

### AT Stare

#### Perm do the 1AC as a method of the Stare. Our argument is a recognition of vulnerability to form safe spaces for discourse surrounding social invisibility. Net benefit to the perm is it guarantees the Stare’s success by guaranteeing we are all on an equal plane of recognition, that’s Hedva 16.

## AT Vehmas-Watson

#### Vehmas-Watson just says political action key to solving but our argument is that it only solves visible instances of oppression without addressing the root cause of it. Our argument is that social invisibility is inevitable within the political which makes true solvency impossible, that’s Hedva 16. Instead we should look to vulnerability as a method of interpersonal recognition and utilize Sick Woman Theory as a method of understanding and interrogating pre-existing power structures, that’s Hedva 16. And our method is key to solving the mindset of education which is the root cause of exclusionary mentalities, that’s Ervelles 2K.

## AT Cole

#### No uniqueness for any of this, try or die, because the aff says the public sphere is already inherently disability. Our Hedva evidence proves that people are inherently oriented against disabled bodies which is the cause of social invisibility.

#### A: You have no alt to solve medicalization, try or die for the 1AC

#### B: Social backlash good, we need to rupture current epistemic modes, that’s Ervelles. Causing backlash is good because it is a challenge to current structures.

# Frontlines to Write

## AT Anthro

Same line of argumentation against afro pess and use it for anthro

Question solvency and mutual exclusivity

## AT Catastrophe Market

Look at the aff

Evans and Sedgwick turn this

Also answers the commodification and visibility argument

Link turn: increase visibility is solvency (Evans)

Commodification of suffering: same thing plus nonunique off of hedva

Victimization: makes no sense in the context of this aff, I am disabled. No victimization

Double bind: either there is not victimization or B I am victimizing myself

## Theory

A: analysis on role of the judge, I control the way fairness and education should be evaluated

Beckett 13 means that the sole job of the judge is to challenge this. The burden is on the negative to prove how their interp allows us to challenge dominant ableist mindsets. Any risk of a reason their interp doesn’t do that means that it doesn’t function under my role of the ballot. It’s a framing argument.

No topical version of the aff means we can never talk about these things and why that’s a bad thing. Hedva explains that.

## AT Medical Model

## Other Ev

#### The debate space is inherently biased, our ignorance advantages the privileged while ignoring the marginalized. A change is needed now, ignorance only perpetuates the problem, Sedgwick [[18]](#footnote-18)90,

**Knowledge,** after all, is not itself power, although it **is the magnetic field of power. Ignorance** and opacitycollude or **compete[s] with knowledge in mobilizing the flows of energy, desire, goods, meanings, persons.** If M. Mitterrand knows English but Mr. Reagan lacks—as he did lack - French, it is the urbane M. Mitterrand who must negotiate in an acquired tongue, the ignorant Mr. Reagan who may dilate in his native one. Or **in the interactive speech model** by which, as Sally McConnell-Ginet puts it, **"the standard. . . meaning can be thought of as what is recognizable** solely **on the basis of** interlocutors1 **mutual knowledge of established practices of interpretation,"" it is the interlocutor who has** or pretends to have **the less broadly knowledgeable understanding of interpretive practice who will define the terms of the exchange.** So, for instance, **because** "men, with superior extralinguistic resources and **privileged discourse positions, are** often **less likely to treat perspectives different from their own as** mutually **available for communication," their attitudes are "**thus **more likely to leave a lasting imprint on the common semantic stock** than women's."4
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